May 27, 2003

David Martinez TWCC Medical Dispute Resolution 4000 IH 35 South, MS 48 Austin, TX 78704

Austin, 1A /8/04	
MDR Tracking #: IRO #:	M2-03-0740-01 5251
Organization. The Texas Worker's C	epartment of Insurance as an Independent Review ompensation Commission has assigned this case to ance with TWCC Rule 133.308 which allows for
adverse determination was appropriate	riew of the proposed care to determine if the e. In performing this review, all relevant medical make the adverse determination, along with any n submitted, was reviewed.
case was reviewed by a licensed Medi in Orthopedic Surgery. The healt statement stating that no known confli- of the treating doctors or providers or case for a determination prior to the re-	ed by a matched peer with the treating doctor. This cal Doctor with a specialty and board certification h care professional has signed a certification ects of interest exist between the reviewer and any any of the doctors or providers who reviewed the eferral to for independent review. In addition, ew was performed without bias for or against any
is a 26-year-old gentleman who in attempted to loosen a large bolt that we noted severe pain in his lower back we front of the right thigh. He also had parand great toe area. The patient was we given physical therapy along with measure slow to improve. An MRI was de L3/4 and L4/5. The patient did not res	NICAL HISTORY  njured his lower back while working on He ras already loosened and he fell on a trolley. He ith radiation into the right buttocks and into the trasthesias and numbness going into the right foot orked up for his back pain with x-rays and was dication for pain and muscle spasm. His symptoms one that demonstrated apparent disc herniation at pond to the above conservative treatment, so he all steroid injections. These were given, but did not f relief.
He was referred to, an orthopedic	surgeon, who felt that the patient was a candidate

He saw, also an orthopedic surgeon, on July 25, 2000, andagreed that the patient was a candidate for surgery because of the failed conservative treatment.
The carrier did not approve the surgery. This patient's symptoms continued and the patient saw who also agreed that surgery was indicated. Again, the carrier did not approve the surgery. The patient went through a four-level lumbar discogram on May 30, 2002. This discogram demonstrated large disc herniations at L3/4 and L4/5 with tears in the annulus at those two levels.
There was rather severe central anal stenosis reported along with stenosis of the lateral recesses and neural foramina reported at $L4/5$ . The large disc herniation was reported in the $L3/4$ area.
has requested authority to do IDET procedure on this patient. This was not approved by the carrier because of the fact that the imaging studies demonstrate nerve root compression and a considerable amount of external pressure from the rather significant disc herniation at two levels.
REQUESTED SERVICE An outpatient IDET procedure is requested for this patient.
DECISION  The reviewer agrees with the prior adverse determination.
BASIS FOR THE DECISION  With reference to Saul & Saul's study on IDET procedure that was presented at the fifteenth annual meeting of the North American Spine Society in in the year 2000, the findings of this patient's discogram make the IDET procedure contraindicated. This patient has a considerable amount of disc material that is herniated and he has large annular tears with stenosis of both the spinal canal and the intervertebral foramina. Therefore, with these findings, the IDET procedure is contraindicated.
has performed an independent review solely to determine the medical necessity of the health services that are the subject of the review. has made no determinations regarding benefits available under the injured employee's policy.
As an officer of, I certify that there is no known conflict between the reviewer, and/or any officer/employee of the IRO with any person or entity that is a party to the dispute.
is forwarding by mail and, in the case of time sensitive matters by facsimile, a copy of this finding to the treating doctor, payor and/or URA, patient and the TWCC.
Sincerely,

## YOUR RIGHT TO REQUEST A HEARING

Either party to this medical dispute may disagree with all or part of the decision and has a right to request a hearing.

In the case of prospective *spinal surgery* decision, a request for a hearing must be made in writing and it must be received by the TWCC Chief Clerk of Proceedings within 10 days of your receipt of this decision. (20 Tex. Admin. Code 142.5(c)).

In the case of other *prospective* (*preauthorization*) *medical necessity* disputes a request for a hearing must be in writing, and it must be received by the TWCC Chief Clerk of Proceedings within **20** (twenty) days of your receipt of this decision (28 Tex. Admin. Code 148.3).

This decision is deemed received by you 5 (five) days after it was mailed (28 Tex. Admin. Code 102.4(h) or 102.5(d). A request for a hearing should be sent to: Chief Clerk of Proceedings, Texas Worker's Compensation Commission, P.O. Box 40669, Austin, TX 78704-0012. A copy of this decision should be attached to the request.

The party appealing this decision shall deliver a copy of its written request for a hearing to all other parties involved in the dispute, per TWCC rule 133.308(t)(2).

I hereby certify, in accordance with TWCC Rule 102.4 (h), that a copy of this Independent Review Organization decision was sent to the carrier, requestor, claimant (and/or the claimant's representative) and the TWCC via facsimile, U.S. Postal Service or both on this 27<sup>th</sup> day of May 2003.